

1 Tania L. Whiteleather SBN 141227  
2 Law Offices of Tania L. Whiteleather, Inc.  
3 5445 E. Del Amo Blvd. Ste 207  
Lakewood, CA 90712  
tel (562) 866-8755 fax (562) 866-6875  
tlwhiteleather@gmail.com

5 || Attorney for Plaintiff

6

7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 N.F., a minor, by and ) CASE NO.  
through his Guardian Ad )  
12 MELANIE FLYTE, ) COMPLAINT FOR REVERSAL OF  
Plaintiff, ) ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER  
13 ) DISMISSING PLAINTIFF'S  
v. ) DUE PROCESS COMPLAINT  
14 )  
15 ANTIOCH UNIFIED SCHOOL )  
DISTRICT, A Local )  
16 Educational Agency, )  
17 Defendant. )

19 Plaintiff N.F. alleges as follows:

## **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

21       1. This Court has original jurisdiction of this  
22 action under 20 U.S.C. § 1415(g), and 28 U.S.C. §§  
23 1331 and 1343. This action is brought pursuant to,  
24 pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities  
25 Education Act ("IDEA").

## **THE PARTIES**

27       2. Plaintiff N.F., a minor, is a student with a  
28 disability who, at all times relevant to this

1 complaint, has resided within the attendance  
2 boundaries of Antioch Unified School District ("AUSD")  
3 and was eligible for special education services  
4 pursuant to the IDEA and State law.

5       3. Defendant ANTIOCH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
6 ("AUSD") is, and at all times herein mentioned was a  
7 school district duly organized and existing under the  
8 laws of the State of California as a local educational  
9 agency ("LEA"). At all times relevant to this matter,  
10 including the period of time that N.F. attended a  
11 public charter school, AUSD remained N.F.'s "District  
12 of Residence" and bore the responsibility for the  
13 provision of a free and appropriate public education  
14 ("FAPE") to N.F.; AUSD, as the District of Residence,  
15 has had the duty to comply with all mandates of the  
16 IDEA and related State law.

## **COMPLAINT**

18       4. Plaintiff was the Petitioner in a due process  
19 hearing complaint filed with the California Office of  
20 Administrative Hearings ("OAH"), OAH Case No.  
21 2020020567. His issues raised in that matter were:

22 1) Whether AUSD, as the District of Residence  
23 for N.F., was required to convene an IEP  
team meeting and to make an offer of free  
24 appropriate public education to him and  
his parents from February 2018 forward,  
25 for the 2018-19 school year, and for the  
2019-20 school year;

26 2) Whether AUSD should have given simple  
27 information to N.F.'s parents regarding  
his proposed placement in April 2018;

- 1       3) Whether AUSD denied the parents meaningful  
2       participation in the IEP process when it  
3       failed to hold an IEP and identify and  
4       offer FAPE to N.F. from February 2018  
5       forward;
- 6       4) Whether AUSD timely responded to the  
7       parents' request on several occasions  
8       from March 2018 forward, for AUSD to hold  
9       an IEP team meeting to discuss N.F.'s  
10      needs, goals, services, and placement, and  
11      whether any delay denied the parents  
12      meaningful participation in N.F.'s IEP  
13      process;
- 14      5) Whether AUSD has denied N.F. and his  
15      parents rights under Section 504, ADA,  
16      and State civil rights laws.

11           5. AUSD moved to dismiss Plaintiff's due process  
12      complaint, alleging that it had no duties to N.F. even  
13      though it was his "District of Residence." On March  
14      12, 2020, OAH issued an Order Granting Motion to  
15      Dismiss, finding that AUSD was "not a proper party to  
16      this action as it is not the LEA responsible for  
17      providing Student a FAPE so long as Student is  
18      enrolled in CAVA." (A copy of that Order is attached  
19      hereto as Exhibit 1)

20           6. The OAH administrative law judge ("ALJ")  
21      failed to consider and apply federal law regarding  
22      public charter schools, specifically, 34 C.F.R. § 130  
23      and 34 C.F.R. § 300.36. Those regulations identify a  
24      public charter school as one of the parentally placed  
25      private school placements for students with disabil-  
26      ties. Nothing in State law or IDEA relieves AUSD of  
27      its duty - as N.F.'s District of Residence - to hold  
28      an IEP for N.F. and to offer him a free appropriate

1 || public education or "FAPE".

2       7. The OAH ALJ also overlooked the fact that  
3 N.F.'s parents had placed N.F. at CAVA and made a  
4 written request to AUSD for an IEP and FAPE offer.  
5 Under clear precedent, a parent may place his child in  
6 a private placement, including a public charter  
7 school, and seek an order of FAPE from the child's  
8 District of Residence.

9       8. Following the OAH Order dismissing Plaintiff's  
10 due process complaint, Plaintiff timely filed a Motion  
11 for Reconsideration. That motion was denied on March  
12 25, 2020, and a copy of that Order Denying Motion for  
13 Reconsideration is attached hereto as Exhibit 2.

14       9. In an attempt to resolve the issue of OAH's  
15 dismissal, Plaintiff filed a complaint with the State  
16 Department of Education, Procedural Safeguards Unit.  
17 That complaint was filed on April 13, 2020, and the  
18 California Department of Education has yet to respond  
19 - in any way - to Plaintiff's complaint.

20       10. Plaintiff now timely files his District Court  
21 complaint to reverse the OAH Order Denying his Motion  
22 for Reconsideration of the OAH Order Dismissing his  
23 due process complaint.

## **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

## **For Reversal of OAH Order to Dismiss**

26 11. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and  
27 every allegation of Paragraphs 1 through 10 of the  
28 Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

1       12. N.F., a resident of the Antioch Unified School  
2 District, was entitled to a due process hearing on the  
3 issues raised in his due process complaint. OAH  
4 denied N.F. that right, dismissing his OAH complaint  
5 based upon an incorrect interpretation of the law.  
6 As a result, N.F. has had no IEP or FAPE offer from  
7 AUSD and no determination as to AUSD's duty to N.F.  
8 under IDEA and State law.

## **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

**For Payment of Reasonable Attorney's Fees and Costs.**

11       13. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and  
12 every allegation of Paragraphs 1 through 12 of the  
13 Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

14       14. Plaintiff seeks reasonable attorney's fees  
15 and costs in this matter, should the OAH Dismissal be  
16 reversed and remanded for hearing.

## **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

18 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as  
19 follows:

20 On Plaintiff's First Cause of Action:

21 That the Court Order the following:

22       1. Reverse the OAH Order Denying Motion for  
23                  Reconsideration and remand Plaintiff's  
24                  due process hearing and issues to OAH  
25                  for determination;

## 26 On Plaintiff's Second Cause of Action:

27       2. Award reasonable attorney's fees and costs  
28           incurred by Plaintiff in connection with

1           his the underlying administrative due  
2           process matter;

3       3. Make any order the Court finds appropriate  
4           in this matter and under its authority.

5 Date: June 22, 2020

6           By: /s/ Tania L. Whiteleather  
7           TANIA L. WHITELEATHER  
8           Attorney for Plaintiff

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28